

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8, 10-12, 14-28, and 30-40 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 11, and 30 are amended by the present amendment. As amended Claims 1, 11, and 30 are supported by the original disclosure,<sup>1</sup> no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Official Action, Claims 1-6, 10-12, 14-18, 21-28, 30-32, 34, 37, and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Nagayama (Japanese Patent Application Publication No. 2000-243558) in view of Iyama (Japanese Patent Application Publication No. 09-138424); and Claims 7, 8, 19, 20, 33, 35, 36, 38, and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Nagayama in view of Iyama, and further in view of Codama et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,114,805, hereinafter "Codama").

Applicants and Applicants' representatives thank Examiner Guharay for the courtesy of the interview granted to Applicants' representatives on the September 25, 2007. During the interview, differences between the claims and the cited references were discussed. A proposed amendment to Claims 1, 11, and 30 was presented, which Examiner Guharay agreed to consider after formal presentation in the present amendment.

With respect to the rejection of Claims 1, 11, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Nagayama in view of Iyama, that rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended Claims 1, 11, and 30 recite in part:

a first conductive layer,  
a second conductive layer opposed to the first  
conductive layer,  
***an insulating layer covering edge portions of the  
second conductive layer;***  
a driving current circuit connecting terminal connected  
electrically to the first conductive layer via a supplementary  
wire, and

---

<sup>1</sup>See, e.g., Figure 4C and the original specification at page 21, lines 10-22.

an organic electroluminescence layer disposed between the first conductive layer and the second conductive layer ***such that the organic electroluminescence layer only contacts a central portion of a surface of the second conductive layer and does not contact the edge portions of the second conductive layer.***

As noted in the present specification, the above configuration reduces the possibility of breaking an organic electroluminescence layer or a cathode to concentration of an electric field. Further, the withstand voltage of the anode and cathode can be improved.<sup>2</sup>

The outstanding Office Action cited anode plate 5 of Nagayama as “a second conductive layer” and light emitting layer 7 of Nagayama as “an inorganic electroluminescence layer” as recited in Claims 1, 11, and 30.<sup>3</sup> However, it is respectfully submitted that Nagayama does not teach or suggest that light emitting layer 7 only contacts a central portion of a surface of anode plate 5 and does not contact the edge portions of anode plate 5. Further, it is respectfully submitted that the figures of Nagayama do not show such a relationship either. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that anode plate 5 of Nagayama is not “a second conductive layer” and light emitting layer 7 of Nagayama is not “an inorganic electroluminescence layer” as defined in amended Claims 1, 11, and 30. Finally, it is respectfully submitted that Iyama does not remedy this deficiency. Consequently, as Nagayama and Iyama do not teach or suggest “a second conductive layer” and “an inorganic electroluminescence layer” as defined in amended Claims 1, 11, and 30, Claims 1, 11, and 30 (and Claims 1-6, 10, 12, 14-22, 23-28, and 31-40 dependent therefrom) are patentable over Nagayama in view of Iyama.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 7, 8, 19, 20, 33, 35, 36, 38, and 39 as unpatentable over Nagayama in view of Iyama, and further in view of Codama, it is noted that Claims 7, 8, 19, 20, 33, 35, 36, 38, and 39 are dependent from Claims 1, 11, and 30, and

---

<sup>2</sup>See, e.g., the specification at page 21, lines 10-22.

<sup>3</sup>See the outstanding Office Action at page 2, lines 20-25.

Application No. 10/828,416  
Reply to Office Action of July 20, 2007

thus are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above. Further, it is respectfully submitted that Codama does not cure any of the above-noted deficiencies of Nagayama and Iyama. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 7, 8, 19, 20, 33, 35, 36, 38, and 39 are patentable over Nagayama in view of Iyama and further in view of Codama.

Accordingly, the outstanding rejections are traversed and the pending claims are believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/07)

Edward W. Tracy, Jr.  
Registration No. 47,998

I:\ATTY\ET\252144US\252144US-AMD10.20.07.DOC